

Sawyer, Kathryn S.
Page 1 of 1

Dear DOE:

Here is my comment on the draft Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement on Livermore Lab operations over the next ten years. The SWEIS calls for major increases in nuclear weapons design and manufacture. New plutonium activities include: raising the inventory from 1,540 pounds to 3,300 pounds; tripling the amount "at risk" at one time; creating prototype bomb cores for a new "Modern Pit Facility;" fissioning plutonium in the NIF mega-laser; and, vaporizing plutonium oxide on-site to separate isotopes. The SWEIS also reveals plans to increase the "at risk" limit for radioactive tritium 10-fold.

1/01.01 I ^{strongly} oppose these actions in the SWEIS that will increase nuclear proliferation and damage our environment. I call on you to analyze conversion of the Lab to peaceful purposes as an alternative.

2/04.01

3/07.01

Signed: Kathryn S. Sawyer

Address: 6848 Ridge Road
Oakland, CA 94611

LAND CALIF

GREETING FROM Far Far Away

To:

Mr. Tom Grim
DOE, NNSA, L-293
7000 East Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550

Schleis, Gus
Page 1 of 2

Draft Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement
for Continued Operation of Lawrence Livermore
National Laboratory and Supplemental Stockpile
Stewardship and Management Programmatic
Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Department of Energy
National Nuclear Security Administration

Written Comment Form
Must be received on or before May 27, 2004.

1/03.01 My name is Gus Schleis. I'm 9 and I live in Berkeley. I'm in the 4th grade at Leconte Elementary. I don't like nuclear weapons. I think they're scary. I also think they're a waste of money. Why isn't there enough money for my school but Billions for nuclear weapons? There are schools closing in Livermore where's the money? I think it's in the bombs. I think nuclear weapons are scary. I like the idea of fresh non-polluted snow to play in, but I don't like the idea of being in a nuclear winter with it raining ashes. I want a future not nuclear winter. I live within

Please use other side if more space is needed.

Comment forms may be mailed to:
Mr. Tom Grim
Document Manager
National Nuclear Security Administration
Livermore Site Office, L-293
7000 East Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550-9234

Comment forms may be faxed to:
Mr. Tom Grim
(925) 422-1776

(over)

Schleis, Gus
Page 2 of 2

he fallout zone if there's an accident at Livermore.

I also have a cousin who works on the laser in the labs. And, this report says there will now be plutonium where he works.

2/35.01

If it's not plutonium, it might be anthrax, or the plague. If they now have biological weapons at the lab, I'm worried about my cousin. I'm worried about me.

In the Bible Jesus says "Blessed are the peacemakers they will see the kingdom of God." It doesn't say "Blessed are the war makers."

Schneider, Dr. David
Page 1 of 1



Dr. David Schneider
OPTOMETRIST
(510) 848-6733 • ds6956@earthlink.net

1736 HEARST AVENUE • BERKELEY, CA 94703

5/05
DEAR MANAGER Tom Grim

Lawrence Livermore Lab needs to rethink expansion

The Department of Energy's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory has proposed new projects that would double the plutonium-storage limit at the site and that could threaten rare ecosystems, including endangered plants and animals.

The Laboratory's draft Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS), released in February, calls for major expansion at the 7,000-acre Site 300, which contains rich biological diversity, including one of the largest remaining native grasslands in California. The proposal includes construction of the Energetic Materials Processing Center, a 40,000-square-foot high-explosives processing facility with three magazines capable of storing up to 3,000 pounds of high explosives. Site 300 is Livermore Lab's high-explosive testing range near Tracy.

The Energetic Materials Processing Center would be constructed in red-legged-frog habitat. One of the areas that is proposed to mitigate loss of the frog's breeding habitat has been detected with low levels of tritium (radioactive hydrogen).

In addition to major new construction projects, "continuing operations" at Site 300 threaten 24 species of birds that are listed as species of special concern. The explosives testing that occurs on a routine basis could possibly affect the golden eagle, prairie falcon, northern harrier, black-shouldered kite, ferruginous hawk, and red-tailed hawk.


Such diurnal raptors that forage directly over the facilities are vulnerable to flying debris and shock overpressure.

Another project that could wreak major environmental havoc is the plan to double the plutonium limit to 3,300 pounds at Livermore Lab's main site. No method currently exists to dispose of much of this highly-toxic radioactive element. In fact, the primary reason for the increase is that the Lab is close to its current limit of 1,540 pounds, but has no way to dispose of its stock. In 1992 the Lab planned to reduce its on-site plutonium to 440 pounds, but other Department of Energy facilities would not take the plutonium that the Lab had intended to send away. If more plutonium is brought in, we can only expect it to remain indefinitely, with no plan or means for ultimate disposal.

One of the new dangerous projects that uses plutonium at Livermore Lab is the Plutonium Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation project. The Lab proposes to vaporize plutonium and then shoot laser beams through it to separate isotopes. To do this, the Lab plans to triple the allowable amount of plutonium "at risk" in a single room from 44 pounds to 132 pounds. By making plutonium airborne, the project would dramatically increase the risk of release, exposure, and accident.

Another proposed plutonium project would create a mini-chamber where plutonium would be fissioned and exploded in the National Ignition Facility mega-laser. After just one experiment, this chamber would be shipped to the Nevada Test Site and buried as radioactive waste. When NIF was initially proposed, it did not include plutonium experiments, in part due to the hazards to workers and the environment.

Sincerely,


Dr. David Schneider
1736 HEARST AVENUE
BERKELEY, CA 94703

NO COMMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THIS SUBMITTAL

Schwartz, Ph.D., Elaine G.
Page 1 of 2

-----Original Message-----

From: Elaine & Daniel Schwartz [mailto:delschwartz@juno.com]

Sent: Friday, May 07, 2004 12:01 PM

To: tom.grim@oak.doe.gov

Subject: Expanded Nuclear activity planned for Lawrence Livermore Labs in Livermore, California

Dear Mr. Grim,

Please consider this letter with my comments on the environmental and proliferation risks from proposed nuclear weapons development and new plutonium and tritium programs at the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL).

1/02.01 I write to you because the DOE has prepared a draft Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) that proposes to ramp up nuclear weapons activities at the Livermore Lab in Northern California. Livermore Lab is working on the design of a new, high-yield nuclear bunker-buster, called the "Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator," and I oppose its development. Additionally, I oppose the development of so-called "mini-nukes" and other new nuclear weapons concepts being researched at Livermore Lab.

Here are my comments on six dangerous new programs being proposed at Livermore Lab.

2/08.02 1. Storage of More Nuclear Materials: This plan will more than double the storage limit for plutonium at Livermore Lab from 1,540 pounds to 3,300 pounds. It would increase the radioactive tritium storage limit from 30 grams to 35 grams. I join California Peace Action and the Livermore-based Tri-Valley CAREs group in calling on DOE to de-inventory the plutonium and tritium stocks at Livermore Lab, not increase them.

3/27.01, 33.01 2. Plutonium Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS): This plan will revive a project that was canceled more than 10 years ago because it was dangerous and unnecessary. The project is Plutonium AVLIS. This is a scheme to heat and vaporize plutonium and then shoot multiple laser beams through the hot vapor to separate out plutonium isotopes. To do this, Livermore Lab plans to increase the amount of plutonium that can be used at one time in any one room from 44 pounds to 132 pounds a 3-fold increase. I join California Peace Action and the Livermore-based Tri-Valley CAREs in calling for cancellation of this project.

4/26.01, 26.03 3. Dangerous New Experiments in the National Ignition Facility Mega-Laser: This plan will add plutonium, highly-enriched uranium and lithium hydride to experiments in the National Ignition Facility (NIF) mega-laser when it is completed at Livermore Lab. Using these materials in the NIF will increase its usefulness for nuclear weapons development. It will also make the NIF more hazardous to workers and the environment. I join California Peace Action and the Livermore-based Tri-Valley CAREs in calling for

Schwartz, Ph.D., Elaine G.
Page 2 of 2

4/26.01, 26.03 a close out of the NIF project and termination of plans to use plutonium and other new materials in it.
cont.

5/37.01 4. New Technologies for Producing Plutonium Bomb Cores: This plan makes Livermore Lab the place to test new manufacturing technologies for producing plutonium pits for nuclear weapons. A pit is the softball-sized piece of plutonium that sits inside a modern nuclear weapon and triggers its thermonuclear explosion. DOE says these new technologies will then be used in a new bomb core factory, called the Modern Pit Facility (MPF). The Livermore Lab plutonium pit program will enable the MPF and production of 150 - 450 plutonium bomb cores annually, with the ability to run double shifts and produce 900 per year. This production capability would approximate the combined nuclear arsenals of France and China each year. I join California Peace Action and the Livermore-based Tri-Valley CAREs in calling for termination of this technology development project.

6/39.01 5. Enhancing Readiness to Resume Full-Scale Nuclear Tests: This plan calls for Livermore Lab to develop diagnostics to "enhance" the nation's readiness to conduct full-scale underground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site. This is a dangerous step back to the days of unrestrained nuclear testing and I join with California Peace Action and Tri-Valley CAREs to oppose any move to "enhance" U.S. readiness to conduct full-scale tests.

7/35.01 6. Mixing Bugs and Bombs: This plan mixes bugs and bombs at Livermore Lab. It calls for collocating an advanced bio-warfare agent research facility with nuclear weapons activities in a classified area at Livermore Lab. The DOE proposes genetic modification and aerosolization (spraying) with live anthrax, plague and other deadly pathogens on site at LLNL. This could weaken the international biological weapons treaty -- and it poses a risk to workers, the public and the environment here in the California. Interestingly, this program is listed as part of LLNL's "no action alternative" as though it were an existing program -- even though it is not yet constructed, Tri-Valley CAREs has brought litigation against it, and a federal Judge has issued a "stay" prohibiting the importation of dangerous pathogens into the facility while the lawsuit moves forward. I join Tri-Valley CAREs in opposing the operation of a bio-warfare agent facility at Livermore Lab.

8/04.01 I believe the DOE plan to introduce new weapons programs into LLNL will promote a new arms race and escalate the nuclear danger. Further, the DOE proposal to double LLNL's plutonium storage limit to 3,300 pounds and triple the amount held "at risk" in any one room increases the environmental threat LLNL poses to the people of California. The SWEIS propels Livermore Lab in exactly the wrong direction.

9/07.01 Instead of proposing new weapons projects, DOE should enhance the peaceful, civilian scientific capabilities and mission at Livermore Lab by proposing new, unclassified programs in environmental cleanup, non-polluting and renewable energy, earth sciences, astrophysics, atmospheric physics and others. The alternative of a "green lab" in Livermore should be pursued instead of the dangerous nuclear weapons future proposed by the Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely,

Name: Elaine G. Schwartz, Ph.D.

Address: 224 Ocean View Ave.
Santa Cruz 95062

State: California

Seitz, Ann
Page 1 of 3

ann seitz
22103 main street
hayward, ca 94541

May 27, 2004

Mr. Tom Grim
DOE, NNSA L-293
7000 East Ave.
Livermore, CA 94550

Dear Mr. Grim:

I hope you are not keeping my letter from your superiors really in charge of extending this genuine outcry from the public regarding all the comments on the environmental and proliferation risks from proposed nuclear weapons development and new plutonium and tritium programs at the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). It seems as though a cut off of dialogue or comments is the DOE's attempt to cut off democratic debate or any public input, yet it is the public who is effected by all these horrid plans.

1/02.01

I write to you because the DOE has prepared a draft Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) that proposes to ramp up nuclear weapons activities at the Livermore Lab in Northern California. Livermore Lab is working on the design of a new, high-yield nuclear bunker-buster, called the "Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator," and I oppose its development. Additionally, I oppose the development of so-called "mini-nukes" and other new nuclear weapons concepts being researched at Livermore Lab.

Here are my comments on six dangerous new programs being proposed at Livermore Lab.

2/08.02

1. Storage of More Nuclear Materials: This plan will more than double the storage limit for plutonium at Livermore Lab from 1,540 pounds to 3,300 pounds. It would increase the radioactive tritium storage limit from 30 grams to 35 grams. I join California Peace Action and the Livermore-based Tri-Valley CAREs group in calling on DOE to de-inventory the plutonium and tritium stocks at Livermore Lab, not increase them.

Seitz, Ann
Page 2 of 3

3/27.01,
33.01

2. Plutonium Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS): This plan will revive a project that was canceled more than 10 years ago because it was dangerous and unnecessary. The project is Plutonium AVLIS. This is a scheme to heat and vaporize plutonium and then shoot multiple laser beams through the hot vapor to separate out plutonium isotopes. To do this, Livermore Lab plans to increase the amount of plutonium that can be used at one time in any one room from 44 pounds to 132 pounds - a 3-fold increase. I join California Peace Action and the Livermore-based Tri-Valley CAREs in calling for cancellation of this project.

4/26.01,
26.03

3. Dangerous New Experiments in the National Ignition Facility Mega-Laser: This plan will add plutonium, highly-enriched uranium and lithium hydride to experiments in the National Ignition Facility (NIF) mega-laser when it is completed at Livermore Lab. Using these materials in the NIF will increase its usefulness for nuclear weapons development. It will also make the NIF more hazardous to workers and the environment. I join California Peace Action and the Livermore-based Tri-Valley CAREs in calling for a close out of the NIF project and termination of plans to use plutonium and other new materials in it.

5/37.01

4. New Technologies for Producing Plutonium Bomb Cores: This plan makes Livermore Lab the place to test new manufacturing technologies for producing plutonium pits for nuclear weapons. A pit is the softball-sized piece of plutonium that sits inside a modern nuclear weapon and triggers its thermonuclear explosion. DOE says these new technologies will then be used in a new bomb core factory, called the Modern Pit Facility (MPF). The Livermore Lab plutonium pit program will enable the MPF and production of 150 - 450 plutonium bomb cores annually, with the ability to run double shifts and produce 900 per year. This production capability would approximate the combined nuclear arsenals of France and China - each year. I join California Peace Action and the Livermore-based Tri-Valley CAREs in calling for termination of this technology development project.

6/39.01

5. Enhancing Readiness to Resume Full-Scale Nuclear Tests: This plan calls for Livermore Lab to develop diagnostics to "enhance" the nation's readiness to conduct full-scale underground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site. This is a dangerous step back to the days of unrestrained nuclear testing and I join with California Peace Action and Tri-Valley CAREs to oppose any move to "enhance" U.S. readiness to conduct full-scale tests.

7/35.01

6. Mixing Bugs and Bombs: This plan mixes bugs and bombs at Livermore Lab. It calls for collocating an advanced bio-warfare agent research facility with nuclear weapons activities in a classified area at Livermore Lab. The DOE proposes genetic modification and aerosolization (spraying) with live anthrax, plague and other deadly pathogens on site at LLNL. This could

Seitz, Ann
Page 3 of 3

Shaw, Laura
Page 1 of 2

7/35.01
cont. weaken the international biological weapons treaty -- and it poses a risk to workers, the public and the environment here in the California. Interestingly, this program is listed as part of LLNL's "no action alternative" as though it were an existing program -- even though it is not yet constructed, Tri-Valley CAREs has brought litigation against it, and a federal Judge has issued a "stay" prohibiting the importation of dangerous pathogens into the facility while the lawsuit moves forward. I join Tri-Valley CAREs in opposing the operation of a bio-warfare agent facility at Livermore Lab.

8/04.01 I believe the DOE plan to introduce new weapons programs into LLNL will promote a new arms race and escalate the nuclear danger. Further, the DOE proposal to double LLNL's plutonium storage limit to 3,300 pounds and triple the amount held "at risk" in any one room increases the environmental threat LLNL poses to the people of California. The SWEIS propels Livermore Lab in exactly the wrong direction.

9/07.01 Instead of proposing new weapons projects, DOE should enhance the peaceful, civilian scientific capabilities and mission at Livermore Lab by proposing new, unclassified programs in environmental cleanup, non-polluting and renewable energy, earth sciences, astrophysics, atmospheric physics and others. The alternative of a "green lab" in Livermore should be pursued instead of the dangerous nuclear weapons future proposed by the Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely,

Ann Seitz



Draft Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement
for Continued Operation of Lawrence Livermore
National Laboratory and Supplemental Stockpile
Stewardship and Management Programmatic
Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Department of Energy
National Nuclear Security Administration



My name is Laura Shaw, I am a teacher in San Jose.

Written Comment Form

Must be received on or before May 27, 2004.

1/14.01

California is an unpredictable state. We have earthquakes, energy blackouts ^{the 1994} and unpredictable people. Near the Lawrence Livermore lab are two earth quake faults. As the Long Prieto and Northridge earthquakes passed, you don't have to be directly on a fault to host an earthquake. Science unpredictability is the first reason that we should not have any more nuclear fuel here. Considering the size of the lab, the soil and water table involved, no amount of earthquake retrofitting can guarantee to protect to total facility.

2/25.10

We have energy blackouts -- too many people and traffic jam -- too many people. I want too many people in the greater east bay area to subject them to a possible traffic accident involving nuclear or biological materials being transported on our unpredictable freeways. Finally, we have people, lots and lots of unpredictable

Comment forms may be mailed to:
Mr. Tom Grim
Document Manager
National Nuclear Security Administration
Livermore Site Office, L-293
7000 East Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550-9234

Comment forms may be faxed to:
Mr. Tom Grim
(925) 422-1776

Shaw, Laura
Page 2 of 2

3/30.02

people. As the article in today's San Jose Mercury News States states: "Amid growing concern that nuclear weapons labs are vulnerable to a terrorist attack, senior Energy Department officials are seriously considering major steps to improve security — including the removal of plutonium and highly enriched uranium from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and other weapons sites" (p. 9A Tues 4/29/04)

1/14.01
cont.

Now is not the time to consider adding any more extremely high risk materials to an already unpredictable and dubious state of security at the research facility. The environmental hazards of this new build up of nuclear materials at this facility are huge and unacceptable to the unpredictable Bay Area.

Sieck, Daryl
Page 1 of 1

DARYL SIECK
1307 HARMON ST
BERKELEY, CA 94702

May 22, 2004

Mr. Tom Grim
DOE, NNSA L-293
7000 East Ave.
Livermore, CA 94550

Dear Mr. Grim:

Please consider this letter with my comments on the environmental and proliferation risks from proposed nuclear weapons development and new plutonium and tritium programs at the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL).

1/02.01

I write to you because the DOE has prepared a draft Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) that proposes to ramp up nuclear weapons activities at the Livermore Lab in Northern California. Livermore Lab is working on the design of a new, high-yield nuclear bunker-buster, called the "Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator," and I oppose its development. Additionally, I oppose the development of so-called "mini-nukes" and other new nuclear weapons concepts being researched at Livermore Lab.

Sincerely,

DARYL SIECK

Sierra Club, Tri-Valley Regional Group, Donna Cabanne
Page 1 of 3



Tri-Valley Regional Group
(Serving Pleasanton, Livermore, Dublin and Sunol)
c/o 3858 Mohr Avenue, Pleasanton, California
94588

April 27, 2004

Mr. Tom Grim
Department of Energy
NNSA
7000 East Ave.
Livermore, CA 94550

Dear Mr. Grim:

1/04.01 The Sierra Club is vehemently opposed to the ten-year operations plan for Livermore Laboratories. The plan is dangerous and unnecessary; it will continuously put our health, our environment, our agriculture, and our community at intolerable levels of risks for years to come. The plan is simply unacceptable.

2/18.02 Let's start with dangers from Tritium. The lab claims tritium releases have declined in the last 10 years. If that is true, why do Livermore ground water wells show higher than normal amounts of tritium? Livermore is part of a closed water basin; we depend on our deep wells for water. What are the current levels of tritium in the water aquifers and in ALL the deep wells situated in the Livermore Valley? Were wells in the greater community tested or monitored for tritium levels? When was the last testing? And how frequently were wells located away from the lab tested? Were all significant sources of water tested for tritium regardless of distance from the lab? Have known plumes tested

3/16.01 higher or lower for tritium levels? Is it true that tritium levels in Livermore wines are three times higher than those of European wines? Is it true that because of these tritium levels, Livermore wines are difficult to sell in Europe because the wines fail to meet

Sierra Club, Tri-Valley Regional Group, Donna Cabanne
Page 2 of 3

3/16.01 minimal European health standards? Europeans don't have to drink wine with high
cont. tritium levels, but we have to drink Livermore water. Instead of putting more tritium
4/24.01 at the Livermore lab, we urge the lab to use their scientific experts to help us clean up the
tritium tainted soil and water that already exists in this valley.

5/08.02 Increasing the plutonium at the lab to 3,300 pounds is absurd and dangerous,
Instead of adding plutonium, the DOE should be removing ALL existing plutonium to a
more secure site that is not surrounded by a city of over 75, 000 people. The real dangers
posed by theft or terrorists are insurmountable. Livermore lacks the high security
protections other sites have, which makes Livermore an easy target for groups bent on
destruction.

6/30.02, Before September 11th, no one thought a plane could be used as weapon; let's not ignore
08.02 the risks that exist with wishful thinking or hid behind so called "effective" ratings. We
all know there have been serious breaches of security at the Livermore lab. This is simply
not the facility to keep even EXISTING plutonium...Consolidate the plutonium at
another site for the safety of the nation as well as the safety and the environment of this
community.

7/17.04, Finally, please consider that Livermore has the dirtiest air in the Bay Area and despite
25.05 efforts to clean it up we were ranked as the 8th dirtiest air basin in the nation. Our
children and elderly suffer from significantly high asthma rates. We don't need more
accidental releases in to the air, not matter how small the lab claims these releases are.
Just what are the current rates of asthma in children in Livermore? Are more cases of
asthma in children detected closer to the lab? Do Livermore children have more lung

Sierra Club, Tri-Valley Regional Group, Donna Cabanne
Page 3 of 3

7/17.04,
25.05
cont.

problems/ diseases than children in communities without labs?

Without answers to these pressing safety , health and environmental issues, it would be unreasonable to move forward with this plan.

We are not interested in fat documents or EIRs that may try to whitewash the inherent dangers of housing even more plutonium or tritium at the Livermore Lab.

1/04.01
cont.

Speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club, as a teacher, and a resident of Livermore for 24 years , I urge you...

Don't waste taxpayers' money on continuing to study a site that cannot be adequately secured from the real threat of terrorism...The stakes are too high; move these bomb making materials out of the area and consider alternative research at the Livermore Lab..

Sincerely,
Donna Cabanne
Donna Cabanne
Sierra Club

Siino, Sabrina
Page 1 of 1

1/04.01

I am writing to express my disagreement with the proposal to expand nuclear weapons work at the Livermore Lab, not only am I against any nuclear weapons expansion, but I feel that this location which is already a superfund site, and so near to a metropolitan area, is not suitable.

Sincerely,
Sabrina Siino